THEOLOGY

Vol. LXII JULY, 1959 No. 469

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

## Editorial

It was in 1920, and preparations were being made for a mission to Cambridge University that was to be conducted by Bishop Gore. Father John How was teaching us in Great St. Mary's Church how to sing Merbecke's communion service. We have never forgotten how he called attention to the phrases "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God" in the Creed and pointed out that the *of* in each case is not genitival but a highly significant preposition (= ἐκ, *de*) denoting origin and derivation. Whether the Creed is sung or said, the preposition should therefore be given due emphasis and proper weight. We have ever since been disconcerted by the discovery that more often than not these phrases are said—even by bishops, principals of theological colleges, and eminent divines—without any apparent sense of their meaning, and as if they were superlatives, like "in my heart of hearts". If those who lead in public worship mangle them, how can the laity fail to be misled and to wonder whether the Creeds are as important as they are commonly said to be? The Church of England uses Creeds in public worship more than any church in Christendom. It might be a good thing to take some time off from reciting them and to use it for reflecting upon the significance of their wording.

* * * * *

*Ideas of Revelation: an historical study* A.D. *1700 to* A.D. *1860* by Dr H. D. McDonald[1] might have been a very useful book. It is a thesis that was approved for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London. It is primarily an historical study of the teaching of British divines in the period indicated, with occasional glances abroad, and with a considerable amount of critical comment with reference to present-day work on the subject. Dr McDonald has unearthed a lot of forgotten theological literature, e.g. series of Bampton Lectures delivered in the earlier part of the nineteenth century. There are interesting accounts of the teaching of deists and anti-deists, of "Coleridgeans" and Evangelicals, as well as of particular divines such as William Law, Charles Simeon and John Wesley. The chronological arrangement is curious, since Simeon and Wesley are brought on the scene and in that order only at the end of the book, but this appears to be because the author regards their teaching as most acceptable. Readers who are concerned about the nature of revelation and its relation to Scripture and to the Holy Spirit will find much here to stimulate thought and the mention of many books of which they will be glad to know.

[1] Macmillan, 30s.

Unfortunately, where we have checked him, Dr McDonald is shockingly careless in quotation and documentation. The book abounds in inexactitudes and minor mistakes, and some of them are grave. E.g. Paley is badly misquoted on p. 83, Tillich on p. 86, William Law on p. 161, and F. D. Maurice on pp. 158, 187. Episcopal orders are conferred on Hooker (p. 37). We are told that when F. D. Maurice lost his position at King's College, London, "he was then appointed Chaplain to Guy's Hospital and at the same time held a professorship in Cambridge" (p. 181). Since this is a book which readers may be inclined to use as a source of quotations, we must warn them always to look up the original sources. Often they will not find it easy to do so, as Dr McDonald very seldom supplies the date of publication of the numerous books to which he refers nor indicates the edition that he has used. This information ought to have been given at least in the bibliography. The bibliography is also open to objection in that it is in the form of an "alphabetical list of books mentioned" in the order of their titles and not of their authors. This is as unusual as it is inconvenient.

* * * * *

*Autres temps autres mœurs.* "There are many cases in which foreign travel may be not only advisable but even necessary; occasions, for instance, of health, or business, or public service, or scientific or literary research. We have rather been talking against mere holiday touring, against visiting foreign lands for the sole object of relaxation, which we do not think, as a general rule, is in the present divided state of the Christian Church, (putting the strange political aspect of Europe, which has nothing to do with the main question, out of sight,) an entirely healthy amusement. There is much to be seen, much to distract the mind, and give it pleasurable occupation in our own island, not merely in such beaten districts as those of the Wye and the Lakes, or the Isle of Wight, but in many another part of England. Those who can superadd to mere scenery hunting some special scientific taste, cultivated for the sake of recreation merely—architecture, for example, or natural history—will find their sphere of amusement proportionably increased, without having too lightly to resort to the perilous experiment of deserting, for the time, the shelter of their mother Church."—*The Christian Remembrancer*, July 1848, p. 28.

---

## Early Christian Doctrines in Theological Teaching

Clarity, thoroughness and balanced judgment are as much the hall-marks of Dr Kelly's latest book[1] on the development of theology in the church of the fathers as they were of his earlier book on the Creeds. What he has produced is, in fact, a kind of Baedeker's Guide to the doctrinal history of the first four and a half centuries of our

[1] *Early Christian Doctrines*. By J. N. D. Kelly. A. & C. Black. 30s.

era, giving a short sketch of the background and a general outline of the principal features of the terrain, recommending where the student should stay, where he should hurry on, and what pitfalls he should avoid. As such, it is a *tour de force*, commanding admiration for its fullness, and respect for its erudition and style. In particular, the chapters on Scripture and the Doctrine of the Trinity call for the highest praise.

When a new text-book is received with such general approval that its predecessor has to go into retirement forthwith, it is appropriate to discuss not only its contents but also the questions it raises with regard to the teaching of the subject. I propose, therefore, in the first part of this article, to review Dr Kelly's book in some detail, and, in the second part, to offer some general reflections on the problems connected with the teaching of doctrine in universities and theological colleges.

(i)

In a book which covers 450 years in as many pages, the author inevitably has to select and compress. The comprehensiveness of Dr Kelly's selection is one of its most valuable features, and inspection of the excellent index reveals few omissions. Certainly the intricate history of the Antiochene christological tradition would have been further illuminated by a reference to Eusebius of Emesa, and perhaps the discussion of the later doctrine of the Sacraments might profitably have contained an allusion to the realism of Macarius Magnes (*Apocr.* 3. 23. Blondel p. 106), but the book is not significantly poorer because the names of these writers do not appear in it. A more serious defect is the absence of information about the dogmatic trends after A.D. 451, which are necessary to a proper understanding of the Council of Chalcedon. This Council is not, as everyone will acknowledge, the "Victoria Station" of the formative period of doctrine; it is much more like Clapham Junction—a place where different lines began to converge. Dr Kelly admits this principle by taking the Pelagian controversy up to the Council of Orange (p. 371), and by referring to some sixth-century authors (e.g. Maximus Confessor, p. 402), but of the aftermath of Chalcedon he has nothing to say (p. 342), and this is a subject which should not have been passed over, simply because it happens to fall outside the period.

The question of compression offers more scope for critical, and, it is hoped, useful comment. Many students will be disappointed that Dr Kelly did not take the opportunity of dwelling at greater length upon the Athanasian Creed, of which he says only that it is "Augustinian through and through" (p. 273), begging the whole question of authorship, and giving no hint as to how he has contrived to grasp this nettle so boldly and firmly. Others will feel that the complexity of the relationship between Paul of Samosata, Lucian and Arius has not received such full treatment as it deserves (p. 230). The possibility of there having been two Lucians is not even mentioned; nor do the brief discussions of the heresy of Paul of Samosata give more than a suggestion of the momentous importance of the deliberations

at the Council of Antioch in A.D. 268 (pp. 117–9, 158–9), which set the stage for the fourth-century debates. It is a matter for regret that Dr Kelly did not feel able to devote a whole section to this topic, instead of simply classing Paul with the Dynamic Monarchians (in any case a questionable association). His views on Paul's place in the theology of the Syrian church, his affinity with the rather naive theology of men like Heracleides, and the question whether the fathers of Antioch ever condemned *homoousios* at all, would have been most welcome.

The only other section to suffer from compression is the one devoted to Apollinarius. Here Dr Kelly was at a disadvantage in not having access to the recent studies by Fr Henri de Riedmatten and the late Dr G. L. Prestige. Consequently, Apollinarius' correspondence with St Basil, which must now be given the benefit of the doubt, does not receive attention, and the sole credit for initiating the development of Basil's thought in Trinitarian theology is given to Athanasius. Again, Dr Kelly thinks it a question of secondary importance whether Apollinarius was a dichotomist or a trichotomist (p. 292). Nevertheless it is an extremely important question, which must be critically examined in order to appreciate the influence of the epistles of St Paul upon the anthropology of Apollinarius. Of no less importance is Apollinarius' discussion of the will of Christ, which led him into a quasi-Pelagian view of man's appropriation of the benefits of the Atonement. Yet, of this crucial aspect of the heresiarch's thought there is scarcely a trace.

Dr Kelly's judgment is so uniformly sound, and his treatment of the views of others so scrupulously fair, that one seldom wishes to challenge him. Three examples may be cited: in the first place, he occasionally refers to the "Aristotelian" bias of the Antiochene school (pp. 231, 281 and 304), in the manner of Harnack and Raven. But it is notoriously difficult to specify exactly what constitutes an Aristotelian bias in an age of eclecticism, and the more cautious judgment of R. V. Sellers (*The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 166), that "it is only indirectly that the Antiochenes may be called the Christian Aristotelians; directly, they are influenced by the ideal of orthodoxy as it flourished among their Jewish neighbours", is probably nearer the mark. Secondly, it is too sweeping a generalization to describe Hilary's analysis of the pain of Christ as a decidedly Docetic strain in his thought. In differentiating between pain experienced and pain felt, and ascribing only the former to Christ, Hilary did not wish to give the impression that Jesus avoided pain altogether, but rather that he experienced it, without his Godhead becoming involved in it. Thirdly, the section on the East and the Roman See (pp. 406 ff.) hardly does justice to the diplomatic skill of Cyril in marshalling the forces of Christendom against Nestorius, or accounts for the fervent greeting which the prelates at Chalcedon accorded to the Papal Tome: "Peter has spoken through Leo."

Every tutor who recommends this book will cherish the hope (in nine cases out of ten, a pious one) that his students will turn up at least some of the hundreds of references in the footnotes, which have

been so carefully and judiciously chosen to illustrate the argument. But it will be difficult for them to find Chrysostom's *De Prod. Iud. hom.* (p. 426) in 18 volumes of Migne, and far from easy to unearth Ambrosiaster's *Quaest. vet. et novi test.* (p. 353) from the C.S.E.L. More guidance, either in the index or in a much fuller bibliographical note, is required to give such references as these more than mere quotation-value. It would also enhance the usefulness of the book, if the blank spaces at the end of each chapter could be used for a longer list of suggestions for further reading. For preference, these should be divided into categories for beginners and advanced readers, and should include as many English titles as possible, in view of the fact that most undergraduates cannot read German, and only read French with difficulty. (There are some surprising omissions in the edition under review: e.g. S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church,* and H. Chadwick, *Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy, J.T.S.,* October 1951, to name only two which are commonly recommended to Oxford undergraduates.)

In conclusion, there are a few points which should be tidied up: p. 79 and elsewhere, Prof. G. W. H. Lampe should be given his initials in the correct order; p. 195, the reference to the use of unction by heretical sects should be included (Iren. *haer.* 1. 21. 3; PG. 7. 664B); p. 264, n. 1, Anders Cavallin has rendered Gregory Nyssen's authorship of Letter 38 in the Basilian Corpus more than a possibility. A general note on the authorship of this and other letters would be of greater value to the student than the present, rather untidy, allusions in the text and notes; p. 302, n. 1, Abramowski's edition of the fragments of Diodore should not be cited without an admonition to the greatest caution in their use; pp. 402–3, "Time-honoured commonplaces" and "conventional clichés" are not the happiest of phrases with which to describe traditional teaching about the church; p. 426, Cyril of Jerusalem's authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses is disputed; p. 436, the general principle *non bis in idem* should be clearly enunciated, together with its curious basis in Nahum 1. 9, before its particular application to the problem of admitting lapsed clergy to communion.

(ii)

In the University of Oxford, theological students are obliged to study the history of Christian Doctrine to A.D. 461, and are therefore bound to regard Dr Kelly's book as a godsend. But when I think of the fundamentalist attitude of many of my own students towards it ("But, sir, Kelly says . . ."), and of their wretched attempts to conceal what, in fact, they are copying out of Kelly in their essays, I begin to wonder whether the book is really a godsend, and whether we are not attempting the impossible in trying to teach so vast a subject.

When the Oxford syllabus was devised, it was assumed that men would have read Classical Moderations, or Greats, or both, before attempting the study of Theology, which could then be, and often was, tackled in a year. Nowadays, however, very few of the candidates in the Final Honour School have had a classical education, and only

the foolhardy attempt the school in a year. In two years students who have no Greek and little Latin are expected to have acquired a reasonable substitute for a classical education, and sufficient familiarity with the enormous number of theories and problems which recent study of the Patristic Age has opened up. And all this at the same time as they are studying the Scriptures and exploring a special subject (if they desire to offer one). A course of lectures on the Classical and Hellenistic background of the first four centuries, and Chapter I of *Early Christian Doctrines*, with possibly a few other chapters of a similar nature, is all the help they will be given, or will have time to get. And so the question arises whether it is desirable to teach the basic ingredients of the doctrine of the early church in the form of a summary or sketch, which is bound to appear abstruse to beginners, and may even seriously mislead, if not utterly confuse, them.

In my judgment the field covered by Dr Kelly, and by the Oxford syllabus, is far too big. There would be sense in taking the development of one doctrine right through from the New Testament to Chalcedon, and even more sense in teaching and examining men in the Hellenistic background of the first three centuries of our era, and being content with one or other of these alternatives. But, in both cases, the discipline would be almost entirely historical, and of questionable value in helping future ministers and teachers to think theologically. So the further question arises: is it absolutely necessary for our theological students to have the history of Christian Doctrine at their finger-tips, before launching out into the more exciting sea of modern theology? Experience in teaching for the Oxford Diploma in Theology tends to suggest a negative answer. The syllabus for the Doctrine paper in this examination (which is compulsory) requires candidates to study the principal doctrines of the Creed in relation to present-day thought. And they find it a stimulating and rewarding exercise. It is, of course, necessary for them to know something of the history of dogma, but such knowledge as they need can be painlessly acquired at the same time as a general knowledge of Church History, and is never a cause for complaint. I suspect that the thrill of grappling with the doctrinal problems of the twentieth century is more than a sufficient inducement to master the outlines of the theological debates of the other nineteen. Experience also shows that men who obtain distinction in the Diploma are as well, if not better, equipped as men who take firsts in the Final Honour School to think out a theological problem. It would therefore seem sensible to suggest that in those universities which do not include modern theology in the Honours syllabus, there should be a paper on the Doctrines of the Creed in relation to present-day thought, and that it should be compulsory. The history of dogma, or some part of it, should be an optional special subject for those who have the aptitude and the training to tackle it. Efforts have been made in recent years to secure such a reform, but, in Oxford, they have foundered upon the rock of the necessity of *Dogmengeschichte*. Dr Kelly's book raises the issue once again, and

teachers who read it will find themselves faced with some questions of fundamental importance:

(1) What is the real value to a clergyman in his parish, or to a Scripture master in a grammar school, of an alpha in the history of dogma? (*Rider:* And what is the value of the common or garden delta?)

(2) Is Dr Kelly's brief introduction to the culture and philosophy of the Hellenistic world adequate to convey the significance of the doctrinal controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries?

(3) Does the distillation of the essence of thousands of columns of Migne invariably result in a clearer appreciation of the problems? To give a concrete example: is the admirable summary of the Council of Alexandria (362) on p. 288 really intelligible to a student who has not made, and probably cannot make, a careful study of the documents?

If there is a satisfactory answer to the first of these questions, and if the other two can be answered in the affirmative, there is no need to press for a fresh approach to the teaching of theology. But I, for one, do not know the answer to the first question, and can only answer the others in the negative.

Similar questions will arise in the theological colleges, where more has to be taught in an even shorter time. Moreover, by no means all the students are of third class honours standard. I understand that a few of the men who have taken a good class in another subject at a university can be recommended to read Dr Kelly's book, and that they profit from the study of it. But the great majority of the men "cannot attain unto it", and are better advised to read something less comprehensive and more elementary. Furthermore, it would appear that Karl Barth can throw more light on the doctrine of the Trinity for a man who is just beginning to study theology, than St Basil or St Augustine. The purpose of a theological college is to teach men who have very different gifts how to expound the doctrines of the Creed simply and attractively. I venture to suggest that some of the students might make a far better job of expounding the Homoousion if they did not have to worry about what happened between 318 and 381.

KENNETH WOOLLCOMBE.

---

## The Humanity of God

IN September 1956, Karl Barth spoke at the Swiss Reformed Pastors' Union. The title, the "Humanity of God",[1] with its slightly Monophysite smell, seems to have been chosen by them. In twenty-four or -five pages we get a very full and clear summary of Barth's position, and of how he reached it. Mr Maurice Wiles contributed to the April number of THEOLOGY a review of the latest two half-volumes of the *Dogmatik* to be translated, and showed by some very

[1] *Menschenlickheit*. Graphische Anstalt Schueler Ag. Biel.

discerning remarks that he was aware in what direction Barth was moving. But no one writing in English has, as yet, given this address the attention it deserved. In Germany it is regarded as marking something of a revolution in Barth's thought.

Barth, as usual, employs a hideous but effective mixture of theological jargon, journalese, and slang. Were one to translate it, one would have to provide a glossary and some footnotes. I shall therefore try to reduce what he says by a mixture of précis, paraphrase and occasional quotation, to a form which will, I hope, be more or less intelligible to the English.

Barth frankly acknowledges that he would have felt greatly embarrassed had he been asked to speak on the subject in 1920, since he would then have seen all sorts of sinister suggestions in such a title. He preferred to put all the emphasis on the "Divinity of God" forty years ago. He was quite justified in doing so, since at that time theology was religiose, anthropocentric and humanistic in the worst sense, since it exalted man at the expense of God. Barth tried "Christian Socialism", but could not find anything characteristically Christian in it. But the thing which most helped to revolutionize his opinions was the sight of the ethical failure of the contemporary theology in the 1914 war.

He felt a right-about-turn was required, and he and his school went to the opposite extreme, and "exalted God at the expense of man". They denounced mysticism, moralism, pietism and idealism. Yet perhaps their picture of God owed more to Calvin and Plato than it did to the Bible. So Barth is now quite ready to retract what he said then. He did say the right thing, but he said it often in the wrong way. A retractation, he suggests, tries to express again in a better and fuller form what you had before expressed in a partial and faulty way.

The "Humanity of God" is "a Christological statement". It is not merely abstract, but made concrete in Christ the Mediator (the Word was made flesh). In him we see God and man reconciled and revealed to each other, and we see grace in God and gratitude in man. These are matters Calvin never worked out properly, while Luther's separation between the two natures and the two realms had the most damaging consequences.

That brings us to the consequences—and as most of us dodge dogmatic theology and love working out consequences it will probably be advisable to give them at some length. Our thinking must be consistent. Here the concept of Analogy asserts its rights. We must make sure what we say is in conformity with the "Humanity of God." We must award man his proper valuation and rights, not as a result of an optimistic estimate of human nature *per se*, but as a result of grace. We must say that the image of God has not been blotted out by the Fall, but that man possesses and expresses in his work and culture (including even theology) a certain subordinate creativity, goodness, and resemblance to God.

Theology should aim not at abstract truth, nor at building up a system, but at conformity to what has been revealed. Bultmann's

existential theology will never attain any clear or decisive result as long as it persists in the ancient error of thinking you can speak of man without first concretely speaking of God. Theology cannot create, and therefore must indulge not only in exhortation, but also in prayer. In other words, grace must be taken into account and God called in—and we cannot switch it on or off, or manipulate him as we will.

(Only think of what can happen to the Eucharistic "Prayer of Consecration". Cranmer with all his faults kept it as a prayer. Extremists on one side made it almost into a command to God, and some would seem to suggest you must give him very exact directions if you want a valid sacrament. Those on the other side reduced what had been a prayer to God into a command or exhortation to men.)

Barth suggests that the "problem of communication" is not quite as burning a one as some people think. In the first place the "outsider" is not as utterly "outside", and in the second, he is not as capable of expressing himself as we think. Even the most convinced Christian has to keep again and again reducing himself to an outsider. And we ought not to think that there are two sets of terms, one to be used by "Insiders" and the other by "Outsiders". One should employ all the terms that come to hand, and use learned words, modern technical terms, slang and everything else that will express one's meaning. One need not be afraid of words which positively depend upon and appeal to Revelation, one will often find the most apparently hostile "outsiders" will welcome them, and prefer them to waffle and soothing syrup. We may therefore say definitely that man is not good, and that God when he says Yes to man also says a very sharp No to his sin. Yet it can be asserted that in Christ the human soul becomes naturally Christian, and that all the prophetic and apocalyptic condemnations of human wickedness operate within the joyful context of the coming of Christ.

Mr Wiles, in the review already referred to, rebukes Barth for his deliberate obscurity as to exactly how far he carries his Universalism. Barth lays down three points. (1) We ought not to panic at the word till we see what it means. (2) Col. 1. 19–20 ought to make us see it can have a good meaning. (3) We are more threatened by legalism than by antinomianism. He insists on keeping a door open, but refuses to specify what exactly we shall find if we go through it. (Why should he not? One may also insist on keeping open Cranmer's "We and all thy whole Church", and Paul's "In everything . . . let your requests be made known unto God", without having to produce a treatise on Purgatory or a list of tariffs for masses! We sometimes boast that we of the Via Media are right in avoiding excessive definitions, and in leaving unanswered certain questions. We have blamed the Calvinists for being a little too fond of pronouncing on everything—so can we not welcome Barth's indulgence here in that praiseworthy form of Christian agnosticism?)

The final consequence Barth draws is that "Christendom" and "the Church" ought to be taken more seriously, if not uncritically. He has a side shot at the "Roman temptation", and at the "German

clerical and liturgical restoration and reaction" which tempt us to forget the Church is under God's judgment. (Our editor in April made a little sortie of his own, in which he put Scots Presbyterians and Ultramontane Catholics in the same box.) Barth says we must not reverse the order, that the Church is an "Event" first and only afterwards an "Institution", yet he remarks "In a really living Church there are perhaps no adiaphora at all!" Belief in the Holy Ghost is empty till it is made "concrete, practical and binding by believing the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church". The Church is the *Christocratic Brotherhood* where the humanity of God takes shape and becomes visible.

Barth has thus discovered that Grace is not contrary to nature—like the Pilgrim in his Regress, he has returned to his starting point, or like G. K. Chesterton he has left his native land in order to return and discover Brighton Pier. His thought has simply moved on to the next objective in working out a "Consequent" or "consistent Christology". Some of us prodigals have accompanied him at least some of the way. We hope the elder brothers will not sneer too loudly.

COSSLETT QUIN.

---

## Criticisms of "An Experimental Liturgy"

IN the twelve months that have elapsed since the publication of *An Experimental Liturgy*,[1] it has been the object of study and comment from Canada to Australia and from India to the States. It has therefore fulfilled in large measure its primary purpose, which was to serve as an "Aunt Sally" and to stimulate discussion "of a specific and concrete example of the form that a revised Order for Communion might possibly take". Since there is no intention at present to issue a completely new and revised edition, the progress of liturgical reform might well be assisted by assembling the many items of informed criticism that have appeared in print or have been communicated by letter and word of mouth. Some of these items are concerned with minor details, and, for the purposes of this article, may be ignored, but others raise issues of importance that need to be faced.

There is unanimity of opinion that the wording of the rite leaves much to be desired. This applies not only to such matters as a preference for the Litany response "We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord", since this is more rhythmical than the one used (p. 36),[2] or for "through whom all things were made" in the Creed rather than "by whom" (p. 34)—it applies to the style and sentence construction throughout. This undeniable fact serves to emphasize the need to secure the co-operation of a master of English prose for the purposes of final revision, because it is doubtful if any group or committee

[1] Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.

[2] The pagination is that of the original publication, which is identical with that of the offprint of the rite and commentary alone.

could produce a work of literary art comparable with Cranmer's rites which, whatever their shortcomings, are models of clarity and style.

After these general opening remarks, it is now proposed to go through the experimental rite section by section, listing the criticisms and commenting upon them.

The Preparation. 1. The adverse criticism has been made that the service starts, with the Preparation (p. 30), stops, with the Confession (p. 32), and starts again, with the carrying-in of the Bible (p. 32). It is therefore "jerky". Such a criticism could of course be brought against any eucharistic rite combining Synaxis and Mass of the faithful, since the one must end before the other begins with the Offertory, and it was no doubt the fact that the two were seen as distinct, though related, entities, that allowed the celebration of the Sacrament alone on occasion in the second century, preceded not by the Synaxis but either by baptism (Justin, *Apol.*, I, 65; *Ap. Trad.*, 21 f.) or by the consecration of a bishop (*Ap. Trad.*, 3 f.). It is true that the devotional introduction was not part of the primitive rite and is the product of later development, but this is insufficient ground for dispensing with it. The psychological factors that led to its initial insertion are still operative to-day, and although it was omitted from the first draft of the Experimental Liturgy, lay participators were insistent on the need for some preparation, thus adding a third element to the Synaxis proper and the Mass of the faithful, which may at first produce the effect of successive new beginnings but in time assumes the character of a steady progression. Notwithstanding this, however, greater smoothness would be achieved by transposing the carrying-in of the Bible from before to after the Collect (p. 32), which would then act as a bridge between the devotional introduction and the Ministry of the Word.

2. *Gloria* (p. 30). There should be greater flexibility in its use so that it is not the invariable prelude to the Ministry of the Word. The rubric (p. 50) allows its omission "on days other than Sundays or Holy-days", but it would seem reasonable to permit its omission on certain Sundays, e.g. during Advent and Lent.

3. Confession (p. 32). Three matters are here in question: (*a*) its form. Many think that the Compline form is too succinct and too repetitive. This is to be acknowledged. (*b*) Its position. It has been pointed out that as the function of the sermon is to lead "to the renewal of penitence and the deepening of faith" (p. 10), it would be more fitting to place the confession after the sermon. This is a very reasonable argument, and it would be preferable to place it after the Creed and before the Litany rather than at the beginning of the service as an additional act of preparation, especially as in the *Gloria* there is already an acknowledgment of sin. (*c*) The absence of an absolution. Many queries have been raised about this, but it seems unnecessary to repeat the arguments in its favour since so far no *theological* grounds for retaining an absolution have been propounded.

The Ministry of the Word. It has been pointed out that a psalm is an Old Testament lesson (p. 32) and indeed was frequently treated

as such by, for example, Augustine, and that the Commandments belong to the same category. This, however, can scarcely be regarded as an adequate ground for not supplying a full Old Testament lectionary to be combined with the Epistles and Gospels.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SACRAMENT. I. *The Offertory.*

1. The Pax (p. 40). Many have expressed a desire to see some action accompanying the versicle and response, such as the touching of hands of the C.S.I. liturgy.

2. Sentences. A sacrificial anthology, additional to the citation from Rom. 12. 1, would be welcomed. Such a provision should be an addition and not an alternative to the Pauline verse, which is inserted as a direct summons to the representatives of the people to bring up their gifts.

II. *The Thanksgiving.*

1. Why split up the dialogue in this novel fashion (p. 42)? If the Sanctus is to be placed at the beginning and if the keynote of the succeeding prayer is the giving of thanks, then it seems a suitable and convenient transition from the one to the other to use "let us give thanks" as the introduction to the "eucharistizing".

2. The position of the Sanctus. Our concern here is with a radical criticism which, if valid, would involve not a slight change of detail but the complete reconstruction of the whole eucharistic prayer. The main points to be noted are: (*a*) Prof. E. C. Ratcliff has argued[1] that the Sanctus was an invariable element in the primitive anaphora and, further, (*b*) that it was the climax of that prayer. (*c*) Mr A. H. Couratin,[2] accepting this position to the effect that "it might therefore plausibly be claimed that the Sanctus belongs to the earliest stratum of Christian worship that we know of, and is one of the oldest ingredients in the Eucharistic liturgy"[3] contends that any revised order should culminate in the Sanctus, and (*d*) that there should be no "second-half" of the prayer with its petitions—emphasis having been wrongly laid on getting rather than giving—but one extended series of thanksgivings ending with the unification of the earthly and heavenly worship.

He would be a rash man who would lightly disagree with the conclusions of the two leading liturgical scholars in Britain to-day, but the present writer finds himself, as yet, unconvinced by their arguments and would draw attention to the following points: (i) Prof. W. C. Van Unnik, in an article published shortly after that of Prof. Ratcliff,[4] has subjected 1 Clem. 34 to a most rigorous examination and reaches the conclusion that "there is no reason whatever to find the 'Sanctus' here. . . . All reconstructions of the early liturgy based upon this fact, which is only a shadow of a hypothesis, have to be revised." In the light of his convincing treatment, the so-called evi-

[1] "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", *J. E. H.*, I, 1950, pp. 29–36; 125–34.

[2] "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora. Note on the Roman Sanctus", *ibid.*, II, 1951, pp. 19–23.

[3] "The Sacrifice of Praise", THEOLOGY, LVIII, 1955, pp.285–91.

[4] "I Clement 34 and the 'Sanctus' ", *Vig. Christ.*, V, 1951, pp. 204–48.

dence of Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian to the existence of a Sanctus becomes suspect. It is one thing to interpret their allusions as references to a liturgical Sanctus if there is clear evidence in 1 Clement that such existed in the first century, it is another to be certain that the hints do in fact rest upon the Sancus when we have no explicit evidence of its use[1] before Serapion[2] and Cyril of Jerusalem. (ii) Even if it be granted that the Sanctus was part of the primitive pattern and that *there was only one pattern*, the evidence does not seem to allow the assertion that it always formed the climax, indeed, if anything it supports the contrary. So, for example, in Justin's *First Apology* 65, we are informed that the president takes the bread and a cup of wine mixed with water and "gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and offers thanks at considerable length for being made worthy of these things from him. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen." If there be a reference to the Sanctus in the opening words of this passage, then it would seem to precede the offering of "thanks at considerable length" and to be the introduction to the "prayers and thanksgivings". (iii) Even granting that the Sanctus was the climax of the second-century rite, it is difficult to see why this should be regarded as the ideal form in the twentieth century. It is true that Mr Couratin, in the second of his articles cited above, has provided a fine rationale of a eucharistic prayer leading up to the Sanctus, but a not unsatisfactory rationale can also be advanced for a prayer opening with the Sanctus. The prayer begins, according to the general custom, with the summons to lift up your hearts—the setting or focus of Christian worship is here proclaimed at the outset, viz. it is in heaven.[3] Moreover, if "the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38. 7) at the creation, if "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth" (Luke 15. 10), and if the heavenly powers recognize Christ, in his ascended humanity, as Lord (Phil. 2. 10 f.) and the angels are "ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation" (Heb. 1. 14), then it is eminently fitting that the Church militant should join with angels and archangels, quite apart from the question of the Church triumphant, in thanking God for creation and for redemption in a prayer which proceeds to thank God (over the bread and wine) for his mighty acts. Nor, granting a knowledge of our weak and sinful human condition, does there seem adequate ground for denying some petitions for the spiritual benefits that the

[1] In Rev. 4. 8 the form is not that of the LXX but that of the later liturgies; yet how far Revelation is evidence of contemporary liturgical practice and how far it is the source of later liturgical practice it would seem difficult, if not impossible, to determine.

[2] It may have been in use in Egypt long before, G. Dix, "Primitive Consecration Prayers", THEOLOGY, XXXVII, 1938, pp. 261–83.

[3] If the Sanctus ever stood at the end of the prayer, and there is some evidence to suggest that at one period this was its position in the Alexandrian and Jerusalem rites, then it may be that its transference was due to the appropriateness of associating it with this versicle.

Church requires if it is to fulfil its mission as the organ of Christ's redeeming work. That there have been developments in the eucharistic prayer is obvious, but not all developments, such as the insertion of a "second-half", are necessarily to be disregarded to-day in favour of a hypothetical second-century prototype. Further discussion of this matter is clearly necessary, but the present writer does not as yet feel the compulsion of the arguments so briefly listed and commented on above.

3. The Thanksgivings should be at greater length. This is to be endorsed, although care must be taken not to prolong them to such an extent that the basic structure, which is action, is concealed by verbosity.

4. Allowance should be made for seasonal prefaces to be inserted in the course of the prayer.

5. The reference to the presenting of "this bread of eternal life and this cup of everlasting salvation" (p. 42), which was found in the original draft of the Canadian revision, is objected to on the grounds that (*a*) it is unscriptural; (*b*) it presupposes a "moment" of consecration, since the offerings are no longer referred to as just bread and wine; (*c*) it suggests a propitiatory offering to the Father.[1] A possible alternative is to speak simply of presenting the bread and the cup, which would not be open to the same objections and would allow a certain elasticity of interpretation—since it may be argued, even if somewhat anachronistically, that in the New Testament "bread" and "cup" are used of the elements after as well as before "consecration"—no doubt essential to secure a *modus vivendi* between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics.

III. The Fraction. 1. It is contended that the fraction is not in the correct position but should precede the Lord's Prayer (p. 44), which is the immediate prelude to communion, this being the invariable practice of the early Church. The evidence relating to this is not without ambiguity, although it would seem correct to say that all non-Byzantine Eastern rites and all non-Roman Western rites placed the Lord's Prayer after the fraction. The first indisputable witness to the presence of the Lord's Prayer in the Liturgy is Cyril of Jerusalem, who omits any reference to the fraction (*Mystag.*, 5. 11). In North Africa, in the days of Augustine, the sequence was clearly: eucharistic prayer, fraction, Lord's Prayer, kiss of peace and communion (*Ep.* 149, *ad Paulinum* 16). The situation at Rome is uncertain, depending upon one's interpretation of a passage in a letter by Gregory the Great (9. 12). Either Gregory transferred the Lord's Prayer from the African position after the fraction to before it or he introduced it before the fraction, it not having had any place in the Roman order previously. In either case Gregory exercised freedom in his handling of the rite, and there seems no reason why present-day revisers should not enjoy the same liberty, in which case there are two grounds for accepting the sequence of the Experi-

[1] W. M. F. Scott, "The Draft Prayer Book of the Canadian Church", *The Churchman*, LXX, 1956, pp. 4–9.

mental Liturgy, which is also that of the C.S.I. Order and of the Roman rite since Gregory: (*a*) the fraction is essentially a preparation for distribution, and it is fitting that it should immediately precede it; (*b*) as one of the great successive acts that form the structure, it stands out more as the immediate prelude to communion than if it is interlarded between the "consecration" prayer and the Lord's Prayer.

2. Prayer of Humble Access (p. 46). Experience suggests that where there is a full "consecration" prayer, followed by the Lord's Prayer and the fraction, any further communion devotion is out of place. Consequently, although optional use of this prayer is prescribed, it is preferable to delete it entirely.

IV. Communion. 1. It has been suggested that for the celebrant to communicate and then to summon the people (p. 46) produces a lack of continuity and that it would be preferable for the celebrant to communicate last, possibly following his communion immediately with the ablutions. There is something to be said for this, but hardly sufficient to warrant going against the almost universal practice.

2. The "Amen" said by the communicants in response to the words of administration should be restored, as for example in the Hippolytan rite (23. 7), or that with which Ambrose was familiar (*De Sacramen.* 4. 25); it has been introduced into the Scottish Liturgy since 1637.

3. Post-Communion Prayer (p. 48). In keeping with the corporate emphasis of the rite, this should be said by all present and not by the celebrant alone.

4. Ablutions. Where a whole loaf is used, as a symbol of unity, and where the Western position is adopted, the ablutions can be a prolonged and unedifying process. There is much to be said for transferring the cleansing of the vessels to the vestry after the completion of the service.

5. Dismissal. There is general acceptance of the arguments against the use of a blessing, but the form of the dismissal, taken from the 1928 Confirmation Service, is not congenial to all and has been described as "gallant-and-high-hearted-happiness-ery".[1] A feasible alternative would be: The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Let us depart in peace. In the name of Christ, Amen.

With these revisions does the Experimental Liturgy approximate more closely to what is needed?[2] May the debate continue to a fruitful conclusion.

J. G. Davies.

---

[1] C. K. Sansbury, "An Experimental Liturgy", *Parish and People*, 24, 1958, pp. 9–14.

[2] H. R. T. Brandreth, "Worship as the Centre of Parish Life", Theology, LXII, 1959, p. 186, would presumably answer in the negative, since he criticizes it on the grounds that (*a*) "the essential act seems to be obscured" and (*b*) "basic theological principles are ignored". The first point will carry no weight with any one who has assisted at a celebration; the second is so sweeping a generalization as to be unanswerable. Until these "basic theological principles", that have been seemingly ignored, are defined one cannot either admit or deny the assertion.

# The Church in Russia: Ex Oriente Lux?

Just after Easter this year a conference on the Orthodox Church in Russia was convened at the Ecumenical Institute in Switzerland to assist the World Council of Churches in its conversations with the Russian Church. The adherence of this Church to the World Council would, of course, be a great addition. More important, the Russian Church might help all Christians to understand the challenge of Russian communism and society.

In 1948 the leaders of the Russian Church wavered between support of, and opposition to, the ecumenical movement and then opted for the latter. They summoned the hierarchs of the East European Orthodox Churches to Russia for a council at which the World Council of Churches was condemned. However, in 1954 representatives of the Russian Church and of the World Council exchanged letters which were friendly but made no bones about actual and possible points of disagreement. Then, in August 1958, conversations were held "in camera" in Utrecht. The representatives of the World Council had been apprehensive lest the tone of the meetings be entirely diplomatic. They were pleased when their fears were disappointed. The conversations had a distinctly Christian ring, and the Russian representatives showed genuine interest and curiosity about the unique modern phenomenon of ecumenicity.

At a pace slow enough to be steady one of the great gaps in the ecumenical movement is being filled. What are we to make of it?

The first issue we must tackle, the theological one, has been discussed since the inception of the ecumenical movement after World War I. Orthodox churchmen outside of Russia were among the pioneers then, and the non-Orthodox Christians had to try to understand their companions.

Three aspects of Orthodoxy are of striking importance to a consideration of the Church in Russia. The Orthodox approach to religion is not so much intellectual or socially prompted as devotional. The Orthodox Christian allows life to spread out her wares unimpeded by categories of thought or logical analyses. He then tries to worship God in this rich variety which he regards as one of God's vehicles of self-expression.

That all of life must, therefore, be sanctified is the second great feature of Orthodoxy. All human yearnings and potentialities must meet their satisfying fulfilment in God. The Russian peasant has his priest to bless every aspect of peasant life and work. Here lies the greatness—and the weakness—of Orthodoxy. While the Protestant unremittingly attacks evil in all its manifestations and thus destroys much that God could use for good, the Orthodox lifts all of life to God so that God may express himself in all of life for man. The danger is that the Orthodox may not sufficiently criticize before he sanctifies.

Thirdly, Orthodoxy does not atomize society into individuals. The total expression of the life of a society is individual, un-dividable. Man is required to merge himself in his historic society, made homo-

geneous by a culture, because God will express himself in part through this culture and society.

But what about the Orthodox Church in Russia? Orthodox Christianity had a unique opportunity there because Russia was virgin soil culturally before the advent of Orthodoxy. Thinking began there under Christian influence. Our word "peasant" comes from the same root which gives us "pagan", but the Russian word for peasant refers to Baptism. Even as late as the nineteenth century, Dostoevsky learned to read in using the Bible. Of course, Christianity met and absorbed into its self-expression Russia's agricultural economy, but no hostile art or thought resisted or moulded the impact of the Faith.

The mysticism of the Slav soul accentuated the Orthodox emphasis on spiritual devotion. The result was a great thirst for what was absolute and a lack of interest in worldly expedients. The Russian Orthodox was far more interested in the hope of salvation in the kingdom of heaven than in the health of society on earth.

For roughly twenty years after the revolution of 1917, Russian Orthodoxy suffered severe persecution. No matter what we may think of their convictions, conviction it must have been which sustained the Orthodox during this harrowing generation. Then, in the wake of the great purges and of the agonizing strain of accelerated industrialization under the five-year plans, Russia was attacked by Germany. Every ounce of national cohesion had to be mustered, and the State called on the Church to support the war effort. In this way the equivocal co-existence between Church and State was inaugurated. The Church has gained more room for activity than we are usually aware of, but she often now issues panegyrics about the Russian Government which make us wince. Meanwhile, during these forty years since the revolution, Orthodox spirituality has effected a slow triumph over the poverty of what enthusiasm Marxism could generate. The age distribution of Church attendants to-day is considered to be proportionate to the distribution in West Europe, though more people go to church in Russia.[1] The Marxism which remains is reputed to be almost entirely utilitarian rather than dogmatic.

How are we to evaluate this resurgence of religion in Russia? At least part of the increasing interest of the West in Christianity has come from fatigue caused by two world wars, the Great Depression and the apparent failure of new cures for social disorders. Similarly, Russian religion may be gaining support from the tired and the disenchanted. But let us hope and pray that the Russians who are the dynamic core of the Church, made reflective by the triumph of Communism which was a defeat for the Church, will take a critical look at themselves and learn from their failures. The mysticism of Russian Orthodoxy, which made most of its adherents uninterested in social and political evils, gave the Communists an open field.

[1] Documentation for these crude estimates was not provided at the recent conference, but the speakers who made the estimates had either first-hand or highly informed knowledge of the present situation in Russia.

The Orthodox sanctification of all of life often blinded churchmen to festering social disease.

The Communist Government has now cured many of these evils; and, though new ills have come in, the Church must appreciate the Christian value of what the Government has done. We can rest assured that the Government will assist the Church to do so! In this way the Russian Church can become alive to the social relevancy of the Gospel. The Orthodox appreciation of the role of society should lead her to comprehend the good in socialism. Her desire to see God in all of life and so to sanctify it could be of eternal value in the confronting of Christianity with Communism.

The Church in Russia faces the unique challenge of Communism at the closest of quarters. Orthodoxy has a unique capacity to understand the new social order Communism has created in Russia, to seek God in this society and thus to lift it up to him. The participation of the Russian Church in the ecumenical movement may lead us to a better evaluation of Communism and to a keener appreciation of the relationship between Christianity and society.

PETER T. MARSH.

## Gospel and Law

"THE law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." It is in terms of this preparatory function of law that the theological relation between law and gospel is normally discussed. But the relation between them is not a one-way movement only. There is a sense also in which the gospel is our schoolmaster to bring us to law, and this aspect of their relation has received much less discussion from the theologians although it might well be said to have the greater importance for our own day.

Christian faith in God is faith in God as a God of history, a God who is active in historical events. The essential nature of the Christian gospel is not a statement about the eternal, unchanging nature of God, but a statement about the acts of God in history.

Response to the gospel is man's response to these historical acts of God. Where man so responds, he is drawn up in the freshness of his initial response to new heights of moral insight and moral achievement. This is the fundamental way in which moral progress is made. If the new moral insights and moral achievements are to be maintained and are not to prove entirely ephemeral, the progress made in the initial moment of response has to be crystallized into the more permanent form of precept or of law.[1] But this process of crystallization has its own inherent dangers. It tends almost inevitably to degenerate into fossilization.[2]

This basic pattern is a part of the fundamental structure both of Old and New Testaments. In the Old Testament, the "gospel" ex-

[1] Cf. P. Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, ch. x, "Ethics in a changing World".
[2] Cf. R. M. Hare, *Language of Morals*, pp. 72–4, 147–50.

perience of the Exodus gives rise to the law, which represents a real moral advance. Even if the historical connexion between the Exodus and the giving of the law may not in reality be quite as close as the Book of Exodus suggests, yet the story presents a vivid and valid picture of their theological connexion. "I am the Lord your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before me" (Ex. 20. 2, 3). The ten commandments and the whole Torah are not the eternal, immutable laws of God; they are a codification of what was acknowledged to be involved in living in response to the redemptive activity of God at the Exodus. As such the Torah was indeed a gift of God to his people. At first the concept contained a considerable element of flexibility. The one Torah of God could be given expression in a succession of different codes of law. The code of Deuteronomy could be replaced by the laws of Ezekiel, which in turn could be replaced by the laws of the priestly writings. It was the underlying concept of Torah, and not the particular code of law, that was of eternal and changeless validity.[1] But in the course of time the thought of Judaism was overtaken by the besetting danger of all who have to do with fixed codes of laws. The link with the "gospel" experience from which they took their origin was dimmed. The Torah became fossilized, and became the rightful object of attack from Jesus and from Paul.

The central feature of the New Testament is the redemptive work of Christ. Here also the experience of the Gospel of redemption gives rise to new moral progress. This is most simply illustrated by the structure of many of Paul's epistles, by the great "therefore's" of Rom. 12. 1 and Eph. 4. 1, which link together into an organic whole the theological and the ethical sections of those epistles. The new moral insights arising from men's response to the embodiment of *agape* in the person of Christ are already being presented in St Paul's epistles in a fairly systematized form. The process of systematization continues; in course of time they are crystallized into the "new law" of St Matthew's gospel or the "sound doctrine" of the Pastoral epistles. In the sub-Apostolic age the whole process went much further. T. F. Torrance declares that "by transforming the Gospel into a New Law" the Apostolic Fathers returned to the impossible situation from which Christ came deliberately to redeem".[2] This is an overstatement, but it is an overstatement of a truth. Far too often, not only in the sub-Apostolic age but at every stage of Christian history, the precepts of Christian teaching, which are a valuable systematization of what is involved in response to the Gospel, have been given a false position independent of their essential source.

This pattern is to be found not only in the narrower field of *Heilsgeschichte* but in the wider life of society at large. The awakening of the social conscience in Great Britain in the nineteenth century was not a new gospel, but it was in part at least a new response

[1] Cf. L. Koehler, *Old Testament Theology* (E.T.), pp. 206–7.
[2] T. F. Torrance, *Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*, p. 134.

to the gospel, a new response to a movement of the Spirit of God in history. When that response had reached an appropriate pitch, it was codified and so made more secure by the process of social legislation. The continuation of that process has culminated in the Welfare State as we know it to-day. But here, as in the biblical pattern, the legislation is in grave danger of being detached from the gospel experience which gave it birth and which alone can continue to sustain it as a living force. If this detachment becomes complete, we shall be in danger of finding with St Paul that "the very commandment which promised life proved to be death" (Rom. 7. 10).

In the light of this analysis the task of those involved in the work of legislation may be set out in a threefold form:

(1) They must seek to ensure that the law expresses the highest common factor of moral response already achieved in the community at large.

(2) Once a law has been made, ways must be found to keep alive the existential creative experience of gospel, which first made that particular law "practical politics". This, I believe, is an especially pressing need in our own society at the present day.

(3) They must be sensitive to new acts of God or new creative situations, which arouse a moral response of such a kind as to make the time ripe for a new step forward in the realm of legislation.

MAURICE WILES.

---

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Kenneth Woollcombe is Fellow and Chaplain of St John's College, Oxford.

The Rev. Cosslett Quin is Rector of St John's Church, Cork.

Dr Davies is a Reader in Theology in the University of Birmingham.

Mr Marsh is a research student at Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

The Rev. Maurice Wiles is Lecturer in New Testament Studies at University College, Ibadan.

---

# CORRESPONDENCE

## TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your recent articles and correspondence on training for the ministry surely make it plain that a single stereotyped form of training meets the needs neither of the Church in the situation now confronting it nor of the men, of varying temperament, ability and interests, who offer themselves for its priesthood. The young graduate with a good degree whether in theology, in an arts subject other than theology, or in science, should be encouraged as an ordinand to

devote himself as far as possible to academic theological study, ranging however over a wider field than "the basic linguistic disciplines, the biblical documents, and . . . selected . . . periods in Church history"—to quote Dr Robinson—which alone may be appropriate to a university syllabus. The man capable of becoming, in some measure, a trained thinker or scholar, even though he may never be called upon to be a professional teacher or wish to be considered a theological specialist, is an indispensable asset to the Church, particularly in an age when the intellectual implications of religious faith are apt to be no less ignored by the believer than derided by the non-believer. For him and his like the theological colleges in or near the university cities are the obvious places of training, and their curricula should be ordered accordingly, full use being made of the facilities provided by the university faculties or departments. The academically most proficient may then in their turn join, in due course, the teaching staffs of university or theological college, the remainder, theologically trained and (it is to be presumed) theologically minded, supplying the parochial ministry with the intellectual leaven which is ever necessary.

But not all men can be furnished with this kind of equipment. For many a prolonged academic training is felt to be, and indeed is, largely a waste of time. Their whole sense of vocation, like their personal faith, finds expression in the practical activities with which, in the average parish in town or country, as experience soon proves, the parson's time and attention are engrossed. Human aptitudes are what they are, and it is idle to desire otherwise. The attempt to impose the one mould—a little of this, a smattering of that, a dash of something else—on widely differing human material can only mean a dissipation of interest and energy to no really effective purpose. A man is best prepared for the work for which his nature fits him, and not stretched on the Procrustes-bed of an abstractly "balanced" or "all-round" scheme. In any case the "practical" man, once he gets to his parish, has scope enough for his talents. It is, rather the intellectual who—whatever the lip-service now fashionably paid to theological learning—discovers himself to be *manqué*.

Yours truly,

B. M. G. Reardon.

Kelly Rectory,
Lifton, Devon.

---

## DEACONS' DECLARATION

*To the Editor of* Theology.

Dear Sir,

In your report of the sermon preached at Southwark Cathedral at the consecration of the bishop on 1 May 1959, you record the Rev. F. A. Simpson as referring to the statement that a deacon is required to make in response to the question, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?" as "in

the plain sense of the words untrue". Having recently made this declaration without compromise of conscience, I am loath to let this provocative remark pass without comment. Acceptance of the Scriptures in totality is fundamental to the doctrinal basis of the Church of England, and it is difficult to see how anyone who regards an affirmative answer to the question asked of a deacon as untrue, can yet profess adherence generally to the doctrine of the Anglican Church. If indeed it is the case that some do make this solemn declaration believing it to be false, one is bound to question their moral right to present themselves as candidates for orders at all.

As regards what Mr Simpson calls the "mitigated form of 1928", it is difficult to see in what way the addition of the clause "as given of God to convey to us in many parts and divers manners the revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ" in any sense weakens the force of the original question. Taken in its plain, literal and grammatical sense, this merely amplifies the point of the original question in demanding belief in the whole of Scripture as the integral self-revelation of God to man. Surely this is a question which should be faced with honesty, and if some candidates believe it to be untrue they should say so at or before their admission to the diaconate, rather than afterwards.

Yours sincerely,
MALCOLM K. SCOTT.

26 ABERDEEN PARK,
HIGHBURY,
LONDON, N.5.

Mr Simpson writes: "Fundamentalists can clearly state, with complete honesty, that they unfeignedly believe *all* the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. But it is not desirable that the ministry of the Church of England should be recruited exclusively from Fundamentalists."

---

## CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Friends and admirers of Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, on both sides of the Atlantic, will welcome your graceful tribute to him in the April number. In commenting on his latest book, you refer specifically to the essay on the relations of Christians and Jews in Western civilization and remark that "seldom has a Christian been able to mark with such penetration how much Jews and Christians have in common and where their faiths inevitably diverge".

This essay, as its title implies, is primarily an historical and sociological study; and it exhibits the characteristic "penetration" to which you refer. But it raises a question of great theological importance. I have read Dr Niebuhr's book only in its American edition (which is entitled *Pious and Secular America*), and quote from that edition.

Dr Niebuhr has this to say about missionary activities among the Jews:

> "Our analysis assumes that these activities are wrong, not only because they are futile and have little fruit to boast for their exertions. They are wrong because the two faiths despite differences are sufficiently alike for the Jew to find God more easily in terms of his own religious heritage than by subjecting himself to the hazards of guilt feeling involved in a conversion to a faith, which whatever its excellencies, must appear to him as a symbol of an oppressive majority culture."

This is not merely a criticism of offensive missionary methods. It is a denial of the universality of the Christian mission.

Prof. Niebuhr's statement has caused some surprise not only in Christian but in Jewish circles. The editor of the journal of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Abraham J. Klausner, makes this comment: "For the first time in Christian history, we believe, a leading Christian scholar suggests that an end be put to the attempt to convert the Jew." Another prominent Jewish Rabbi, Arthur Gilbert, has written a reply to Niebuhr in which he admits that he was among those who at first applauded his apparent "tolerance". On later reflection, however, he felt bound to reject Niebuhr's "denial of the legitimate evangelistic mission". Rabbi Gilbert believes that Judaism has a universal mission. Holding this view for himself, he cannot deny it to another. "So ultimately", he says, "I reject Niebuhr's denial of the evangelistic dimension in the absolute faith". Is it fair to suggest that Prof. Niebuhr has, in this matter, allowed his theological judgment to be determined by non-theological criteria, and thus fallen into the pit from which he has striven so strenuously and successfully to rescue his fellow-Christians?

Peculiar difficulties attend any discussion of the relations of Christians and Jews in the United States of America. It might therefore be a good thing if the immensely important theological questions, which are implicit in Prof. Niebuhr's article, were to be debated in the pages of Theology. If Prof. Niebuhr's assumption that the Old Israel has no need of the New Covenant provokes such debate, he will inadvertently have rendered yet another service to theological thought.

Yours faithfully,

Charles W. Ranson,
*Director.*

Theological Education Fund of the International Missionary Council,
160 Fifth Avenue, New York 10.

## CHRISTIANITY AND CULTURE IN AFRICA

*To the Editor of* Theology.

Dear Sir,

I suspect Mr Sanderson of being deliberately provoking. He accuses me of (*a*) living in the past and desiring to preserve a dying "primitive" African culture; (*b*) forgetting that Western education is rapidly replacing the old culture; (*c*) ignoring the fact that nation-

alism is the real problem; (*d*) living in Johannesburg. None of these things is true: see my references to (*a*) "Ming vases" and "parallel segregation", which indicate that I do not think it possible to preserve primitive African culture; (*b*) the difficulties in liturgical translations, which shows that I am aware of the infinite variety of derived "cultures"; (*c*) Sundkler's book and the "sects", where I was concerned to show that nationalism is at least partly responsible for the existence of the "sects". Your own note "Our Contributors" gives my address as Grahamstown, which could hardly be farther from Johannesburg, temperamentally or geographically.

Fr Pawson, who *does* live in Johannesburg, is more temperate, and I am prepared to admit the justice of his comments. It is, no doubt, as misleading to represent Dr Shropshire as typical of the Catholic school as it is to represent "primitive" rural life as typical of African culture. If that is what I have appeared to do, I have expressed myself badly. I chose these particular examples *because* they are extreme and, by making the contrast most sharply, show the problem most clearly.

But I do not think that anything which either of your correspondents has said diminishes the problem. The culture which the African is building is still an African culture, as Fr Pawson shows. This new culture cannot deny the whole history of the African people (even if that history is unwritten). I should have thought that it was plain that Mr Sanderson was contradicting himself when he remarks, on the one hand, that the African is taking over Western civilization "lock, stock, and barrel", and, on the other, that nationalism is the real problem. That very nationalism is helping to create an African civilization which is not Western civilization (fortunately), however much it may resemble it superficially.

There is another fact, peculiarly South African, which has to be taken into account. In this country we have deliberately embarked upon a policy of iniquitous educational rationing which will, if it succeeds, perpetuate and emphasize the distinction between African and Western civilization.

The Church has still to plant an African Christianity which is not English Christianity (complete with gothic windows and rural deans); which is Catholic and not "sectarian" (and will yet produce African leadership). Fr Pawson's point about the onion-peelers is well taken. I am with him in wanting to preach a Christianity-plus-Catholic-accretions (i.e. the faith as lived and experienced by the Church in history), but I do not want it to be unnecessarily burdened with sectarian, national, or even cultural accretions. Where to draw the line between the two, and how best to transmit the experiences, were precisely the problems which I was attempting to raise in my original letter.

Yours sincerely,
PETER HINCHLIFF.

ST PAUL'S COLLEGE,
GRAHAMSTOWN,
CAPE PROVINCE.

## "JUNG AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL"

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In reply to Dr Philp's comments on my notice of his book of the above title: I did explicitly recognize that he disclaimed any intention of defending the doctrine of *privatio boni,* and meant only to vindicate it against Dr Jung's "misinterpretations". My point was only that the elucidation of a doctrine for which neither Dr Philp nor the Church takes definite responsibility did not seem a good way of opening a polemic upon the main issue. Also, I never denied or forgot that Dr Philp gave long treatment to the themes of Satan, the Quaternity and Job. My suggestion was that these might have been better handled from the standpoint of the function of the Church. Getting to grips with questions on the frontier between psychology and theology is the difficulty that I feel the book hardly overcomes. I still maintain that what is written on p. 185 about the "transcendental borders" of consciousness misunderstands the Jungian position it deals with, and think many readers will agree.

I confess I have no excuse, and apologize, for having read the publishers' announcement inside the dust-cover with too little care; that is why I changed my sentence about the letters being previously unpublished into a guarded sentence (from a faint idea that it might not cover the "supplementary" letters). This I should not have done, and I sincerely regret it.

Yours sincerely,
PHILIP MAIRET.

LEWES.

---

# BOOK REVIEWS

ALLEGORY AND EVENT: A STUDY OF THE SOURCES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF ORIGEN'S INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE. By R. P. C. Hanson. S.C.M. Press. 30s.

Dr Hanson's book, both by the extent of its documentation and by the penetration of its judgments, is a contribution of great importance to the contemporary study of the sources and significance of Origen's exegesis. Father de Lubac, in his *Histoire et Esprit,* sees in Origen's allegorism, regarded as a whole, a legitimate development of the Christian interpretation of Scripture. I have myself tried, in my book *Origen,* to distinguish authentic elements of Jewish-Christian typology from an allegorism of Greek or Gnostic origin which is mixed with them or juxtaposed alongside them. Dr Hanson in his turn establishes the mixed character of Origen's exegesis. He rightly emphasizes against de Lubac the influence of Greek allegorism. But he seems to me to go to the opposite extreme when he thinks that Origen's exegesis is wholly falsified thereby.

The opening chapters, which survey the course of exegesis before Origen, have a lively interest in that they show the diverse tendencies

that were at work in the Jewish and Christian world. Hanson shows first that Palestinian Judaism was characterized by a biblical typology which can be seen in particular in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition, the rabbinic writings reflect an allegorical exegesis. Hanson clearly distinguishes between *typology*, which marks analogies between situations in the Old and New Testaments, and *allegory*, which looks for a symbolic meaning throughout the text of Scripture. This essential distinction is rejected by de Lubac, and this rejection is one of the most serious faults in his thesis on account of the confusions that follow from it. Alongside this Palestinian exegesis there is an Alexandrian exegesis which was influenced by the pagan exegesis of Homer, and is seen above all in the allegorism of Philo.

The different tendencies were continued in Christianity. Hanson recalls the presence of a christological typology in the New Testament, which was carried on by Justin and Irenaeus (pp. 65–78). On the other hand, he shows that St Paul made use of Palestinian allegorism, notably in Gal. 4. 21–31, the only passage where the verb *ἀλληγορεῖν* is found in the New Testament. He rightly maintains against Spicq that in the Epistle to the Hebrews there is an allegorizing typology which is of Alexandrian but not Philonian origin and which appears again in the Epistle of Barnabas. Grant however is right, in opposition to Hanson, in deriving the exegesis of Theophilus of Antioch from the Gnostic Palestinian exegesis and not from Philo's. It is only with Clement of Alexandria that the influence of Philo makes itself felt.

The complexity of the exegetical tendencies that lay behind Origen can thus be seen. Hanson's main achievement in my opinion is to have shown the existence of a Jewish, Palestinian and Alexandrian allegorism, which owed nothing to pagan allegorism. For this makes it possible to establish against the thesis of Jean Pépin, in *Mythe et Allégorie*, that Christian allegorism is not always of pagan origin. On the other hand, one should not conclude from this, with de Lubac, that it is an original part of the Christian tradition. This is true only of typology, and I hold to it in spite of what Hanson says (p. 370). But there is as well, in the New Testament and in the early Christian writings, mixed with typology a Jewish allegorism which is a cultural phenomenon like Greek allegorism.

How about Origen? Hanson maintains with good reason that his allegorism was profoundly influenced by the different tendencies which preceded him. Philo's influence is obvious. But Hanson underestimates the influence of Gnostic allegorism, especially as regards the exegesis of the New Testament. These influences involved Origen in applying allegorism to the whole of Scripture, in a failure to appreciate the literal sense, and in a process of rationalization which de Lubac seeks in vain to deny. With reference to him Hanson justly remarks: "It is this sort of wild distortion that makes the reader of his book regret that the author's learning and acumen have been devoted to a partisan presentation of Origen's thought" (p. 224).

But Hanson seems to me to go too far when he says that the influence of Jewish-Greek allegorism entirely falsifies Origen's exegesis.

For there is in Origen's work an absolutely authentic typology. Mixed up with it generally there are no doubt allegorical elements. But it is still radically different from the Philonian allegory in its historical character. This is true only of part of Origen's work: it also contains Philonian and Gnostic types of allegorism. But one ought at least to acknowledge the presence of genuine typology. If de Lubac was mistaken in justifying Origen's exegesis as a whole, I think Hanson goes too far in condemning it.

Jean Daniélou.

Paris.

---

Corpus Christi. The nature of the Church according to the Reformed Tradition. By Geddes MacGregor. Macmillan. 30s.

The Rise of Protestantism. By William Haller. Hamish Hamilton. 15s.

Dr MacGregor says of his new book that it is written in a spirit of obedience to the canonical injunction of the authorities of his Church to study the "theological principles involved in the Conversations now in progress between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland". It will be well to review, and to read, *Corpus Christi* with that fact in mind.

The study is in two parts—historical and dogmatic. In each, Dr MacGregor emphasizes the fact that in the Churches of the Reformed Tradition "there has always been a marked historical sense of belonging to the Holy Catholic Church" (p. 20). In particular he is at pains to insist that the polity of the Reformed Church is in no way to be identified with separatism. This emphasis will be a salutary lesson to many, and a timely reminder to all, Anglicans, whose thinking is inevitably coloured by the historical fact that the Elizabethan rejection of the Presbyterian polity drove the Genevan tradition in England into a separatism which was not natural to it, and which resulted all too often in separatism spilling over into sectarianism, a process and an ethos so brilliantly analysed in William Haller's great book, *The Rise of Puritanism,* which is now re-issued in a most welcome (though alas not very cheap) American paperback.

In the historical section Dr MacGregor underlines the fact, which again may come as a surprise to many Anglicans, that the Church of Scotland has always claimed a continuity with the pre-Reformation Church: "there is no evidence that, even in the disorderly state of affairs that prevailed in Scotland during the decades preceding the year 1560, either the reforming pastors or their flocks intended to repudiate the historic conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, in favour of a separatist ecclesiology" (p. 69). This fact was demonstrated, with a wealth of historical evidence, by Dr G. Donaldson in his 1958 Birkbeck Lectures, which showed very clearly that the early history of the Church of Scotland was not so very different from that of the Church of England, and that its typically Presbyterian and anti-episcopal polity was the work not of Knox but of

Melville a generation later. Yet even on that vexed question Dr MacGregor is able to point out that such typical seventeenth-century Scottish divines as the "Aberdeen doctors", while having no doubts about the validity of Presbyterian orders, yet "regarded bishops as of the *melius esse* of the Church, seeing in them . . . a bond of unity with the Universal Church" (p. 109).

The dogmatic section of the book begins with the unequivocal statement that "every formulation of a doctrine of the nature of the Church depends upon and implies a christological foundation" (p. 110); Dr MacGregor cites Père Congar and Prof. T. W. Manson here, and an Anglican may claim that he might have added Hooker (Bk V, Chaps li–lvi, a passage quoted with approval by Congar on this subject). But, for all that, one has the feeling that the subsequent discussion is never very firmly anchored to its christological moorings. Instead the dominant theme of this part of the book is that "the doctrine (of the Church) in the Reformed tradition cannot be understood apart from the context of the biblical idea of headship, of which we must constantly remind ourselves" (p. 153, cf. pp. 170 and 227). It is, for instance, the necessity of safeguarding the headship of Christ as alone "the ground of unity and continuity", which precludes the acceptance of any doctrine of apostolic succession as a *guarantee* of unity and continuity, though the bishop has "the most important role . . . of signifying the unity of the Church" (p. 208, my italics, and p. 227). An Anglican surely does not need to hold a particularly "low" doctrine of episcopacy to find himself in agreement with these views, yet one wonders whether there are not places in his fine exposition of the doctrine of the Church, where Dr MacGregor errs on the side of stressing the teaching of Ephesians iv on Christ's headship over the Body, at the expense of that of 1 Corinthians xii, where he is identified with the *whole* Body. Surely the New Testament paradox of headship and identification is the ecclesiological parallel to, and the outcome of, the Christological paradox of the divinity and humanity of Christ. And surely this paradox was recognized by Calvin himself, for he was saved from the perfectionist separation of a gathered Church by the realization, not only that the Body of Christ must be spoken of in terms of *aedificatio, profectus* and *incrementa*, but also, and despite this, that it is the eschatological instrument of the *regnum Christi*.

Yet there are many things here which Anglicans will gain by studying, many emphases which must find their place in the theology of a re-united Church. There are many things which are finely said, and many which will seem to point a way ahead. There is the recognition that "unity does not require uniformity; but this is not to say that it is unrelated to external order, or that it is expressed only . . . in the practical help of one part of the Body for another" (p. 126). There is the presentation of Calvin's doctrine of baptism—"not a transaction between God and individuals only", but the covenanted incorporation into the Body of Christ (Chap. VI). There is the insistence that "the uniqueness of the Church is seen, not when it is presented as having the sacraments, but when it confronts us as the

eucharistic koinonia" (p. 155); certainly one hopes that Anglicans no longer subscribe to the former view, which received its classic and most disastrous exposition in the fourth of the *Tracts for the Times*. There is the affirmation (p. 195) that "it is just that eschatological element (sc. in the Eucharist) that ought most vividly to bring to our notice the theological doctrine of the Real Presence that is fundamental to the Reformed tradition", and there is the hint (pp. 182 ff.) that it was only the exigencies of the Reformation situation which led to the omission of the *epiclesis* from Reformed Eucharistic liturgies.

Dr MacGregor has given us a stimulating book, and one which will prove valuable in the continuing debate. He may truly make the rejoinder to his Anglican readers, which has now been made by the Inter-Church Relations Committee of the General Assembly—that the sad fact remains that the 1957 Joint Report has aroused much less interest in the Church of England than in the Church of Scotland. Dr MacGregor has done something to ensure that what interest there is is theologically informed.

Barry Till.

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

---

An Archbishop of the Reformation: Laurentius Petri Nericius, Archbishop of Uppsala, 1531–73. A Study of his Liturgical Projects. By Eric E. Yelverton. Epworth Press. 18s. 6d.

Dr Yelverton's name has for long been associated with Swedish liturgical studies and the present volume is a worthy companion to his *The Manual of Olavus Petri*, published in 1953, and the two volumes might be read together with profit.

The book illuminates the historical roots of the present controversy in Sweden between Church and State, and enables us to appreciate the difficulties which beset the Swedish Church. "The Church of Sweden to-day has little impact upon the life of the nation", yet there are obvious signs of revival in biblical studies, and the movement known as "Church Renewal", *Kyrklig Förnyelse*, has many resemblances to the Tractarian Movement and owes much of its inspiration to a recovery of the insights of Laurentius Petri.

Laurentius Petri was thirty-two when he was appointed Archbishop of Uppsala, and for the next forty-two years he was the main architect of the Reformation in Sweden. In 1541 the first Swedish Bible was published, the joint work of Laurentius and his brother Olavus. His most important liturgical achievement was *The Church Order of 1571*, which considerably enriched the original *Manual* of 1529, the work of his brother. *The Manual* was the first vernacular Prayer Book to appear in a modern language, and was the basis of Laurentius's liturgical work. There can be few occasions in the history of the Church when two brothers have so decisively influenced the spiritual life of a nation. Though influenced by German Church Orders, the Swedish Church Order is not an imitation of

them, for Laurentius chose his models with discernment and adapted them to Swedish conditions. This work is the inspiration of most successive Swedish formularies, and much of it lives in the *Church Manual* of 1942. Dr Brilioth described the 1571 work "as one of the greatest of all the existing monuments of a truly evangelical *via media*". There are, however, two surprising omissions in that it did not provide rites for the administration of Confirmation and for the ordination of deacons.

Throughout his work there is striking evidence of his pastoral concern, and some of his directions have a contemporary note, particularly his desire that those who are to be married are to have careful preparation; his ruling that Baptism shall be really public; his desire that Godparents should be "true Christians" and that they, together with parents and friends, should receive Holy Communion on the occasion of the Baptism.

The book is a significant and important contribution to the literature of the Reformation. When it is reprinted, Baptism should be added to the subject-index.

Gwyn Rogers.

Liverpool.

---

The Paradise Tree. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Collins. 18s.

Both the theme and the ethos of *The Paradise Tree* are well summed up in its motto from Clement of Alexandria: "O truly sacred mysteries! O pure light! The Lord reveals the sacred signs, for he himself is the hierophant. And thou shalt dance with angels around the unbegotten and imperishable and only true God, and God's Word shall join with us in hymns of praise." Fr Vann is concerned to show the close relationship between the old universal symbols, such as the sun, darkness, the mother, water, wood, bread and wine, etc., and the new Christian revelation. "The former point the way to the latter; form a natural, perhaps unconscious, prolegomenon to the acceptance of the latter." He quotes Beirnaert's *The Mystic Dimension in Christian Sacramentalism*: "The revival by Christ and by the Church of the great images . . . signifies an evangelization of the affective powers designated by the images. It is not necessary to reduce the Incarnation to simply the taking on of flesh. God has intervened even in the collective unconscious in order to save it and fulfil it." Fr Vann concludes: "Both ways of knowledge are necessary: we need dogma to prevent us from straying, in our apprehension of symbol, into strange paths—and the history of mysticism shows how strange such paths can be; on the other hand, we need the vitality of symbol to prevent us from coming to find that doctrine and dogma have become for us dead things, dry bones."

Many will be grateful to Fr Vann for this formulation of the mode by which the Christian apprehends God's Truth, and for his insistence on the *exclusive* role of the formulation of dogma. The more is it to be regretted that in the rest of his book he often seems to fail in the disciplined application of these two ways of knowledge upon

each other. His "typologizing" with universal symbols is often as fanciful as that of earlier Christian writers with the Old Testament (e.g. in his treatment of the Epiphany), nor does he really come to grips with the relation between the universal symbolism and the historical pattern of revelation in the Old Testament, though in quoting Prof. Eliade's book *Images et Symboles* he recognizes the supremacy of the latter. Fr Vann sets out to trace the pattern of these images in the life of Christ, in the Commandments, and in the Sacraments, principally in the Mass, but one feels that this form has been imposed upon the substance of the book, some of which is drawn from previously published material.

If then *The Paradise Tree* is disappointing in not fulfilling the rich promise of its first chapter, it nevertheless contains much that Fr Vann's readers will cherish. His joyful and positive approach to the whole of life refreshes as much as his deep understanding of the central themes of the Faith. To take but one example—his words on Christian marriage are no less wise and beautiful than his meditation on Communion and Heaven.

VICTOR DE WAAL.

ELY.

---

THE SERMONS AND DEVOTIONAL WRITINGS OF GERALD MANLEY HOPKINS. Edited by Christopher Devlin. Oxford University Press. 42s.

The Poems, the Letters, the Journals . . . and now this substantial offering. The long-obscured Hopkins has received full recompense, editorially as well as critically. Almost inevitably the youth of peculiarly stressed temperament meeting that peculiar Oxford atmosphere "went over" to Rome—and having done so, went the whole hog by becoming a Jesuit. Inevitably the Society has now made something of a corner in the Hopkins market (providing in Fr Peter's study the best single critique of the poetry). This not from any sense of reparation due to a spoiled genius, rather from a justifiable family pride, and from the qualification of shared experience and discipline.

Fr Devlin guides expertly through the subtleties of Scotism and the deep places of the Spiritual Exercises (shallow to the casual glance). Thorough of course, he is also deft, sensible, vigilant and quietly humorous. Soaked in the poems, he provides many apt cross-references. When Hopkins strays into silliness he can temper approval, e.g. "we cannot doubt that at the last Supper Christ invisibly but sacramentally communicated his Blessed Mother . . . by the hands of angels or otherwise. After this she would have fasted till the Resurrection and the Sacred Host have lain in her breast unconsumed". Which, says the editor, "seems to go counter to the nature of the sacrament". Or when it's declared that, far from sinning, the Virgin was never even tempted—well, "this is merely the private opinion of certain devout authors".

He knows when to be tentative. Few critics have combined restraint and penetration when faced with the intriguing "Poet versus

Priest" situation, the alleged "vocational tension". Naturally Devlin does not romanticize nor smear terms like "masochism" over things. He shows us how Hopkins at certain periods and in certain moods drew from his doctrine of "the great sacrifice" an antithesis (which he *normally* recognized as a false one) between the affective and the elective wills, between desire and choice. It accorded well with the zeitgeist of Kantian ethical heroism and with such prescribed reading as Thomas à Kempis.

The Writings are a mixed dish, heavy chewing in parts for all the editorial condiments. But many passages of the last Retreat Notes and discourses move one by their "much bitter thought but also insight in things". Although "my life is determined by the Incarnation down to most of the details of the day", yet" five wasted years almost have passed in Ireland. . . . All my undertakings miscarry: I am like a straining eunuch. . . . O my God, look down on me. . . ."

The sermons are more on a level, with evidence of "off-days" when, as Fr Devlin says, he tended to chop logic and play frigidly with "conceits". He commands at best a cogent manly "middle style". He can talk of his auditors going down into the pits or getting drunk, without the customary Victorian pulpit rhetoric; or illustrate from the cricket field—when the other batsman hangs back "how eagerly the first will cry—Come on, come on!—a Paraclete is just that, something that cheers the spirit of man with signals and with cries. . . ." He can use the word "sweatheart" with safety at Bedford Leigh but with censure from above in Liverpool! Likewise the philosophical dissertations rejoice to grip on good Anglo-Saxon terms, "swale", "cleave", "neap", "pitch" (equals "haecceitas").

Yet he was never a really popular preacher. Least so in Liverpool, where he least felt at one with his hearers. But the question of rapport is a subtle one, and the answer in part physical. Hopkins lacked the successful comedian's confidence of being "en rapport" from the outset, and the "vulgarity" of Fr Tom Burke who could stunt by beginning with a thrice-bellowed "To hell with the Jesuits!"

Comparisons come and go in the mind: Coleridge, Newman, Maurice, and, surprisingly often, Kierkegaard! Mutatis mutandis, there is great spiritual and psychological affinity. There is the same fantastic streak, the same persistence in one point, the same poetic feeling for language, the same fertility and felicity of metaphor, and a comparable quality of anguish. Stricken spirits, "beautiful and swift".

D. W. Foster.

Hull.

---

What is Evangelism? By Douglas Webster. Highway Press. 5s.

The fact that this is a paper-back and costs five bob should not lead potential readers to suppose that it is just "another little book on evangelism". From the previous super-wordbooks in which Mr Webster has specialized, we have learned to expect a high standard of clarity, freshness, and learning that is lightly worn. This book

possesses all these qualities, and with them a certain magnanimity that matches the wide range of the author's inquiry. It is a relief to find an honest critic of the Church who is not so much querulous as humble and who holds out some hope for us; it is a relief to find a whole-hearted evangelist who is never cranky, does not claim cheap successes, and does his best (in the last chapter) to heal the false antithesis between baptism and conversion, between "experience" and the sacramental life. Here are two samples of Mr Webster's judgment:

"The modern intellectual is not unlike Job. He clings to this integrity, he suffers and he asks questions. It will be remembered that his friends with their easy words, their reasoned phrases, their glib dogmas and their safe distance from his existential situation, had no effect on him whatever. They were too ready to speak, too slow to listen. They never began to enter into Job's problem. It is important that the Christian, especially the evangelist, should not play the role of Job's comforter to the intellectual of to-day" (p. 58). "There is no example anywhere in the New Testament to compare with the problems of evangelism among people of a *different* culture, such as those which to-day confront Western missionaries in Africa or Asia, or to compare with the quite new problems of evangelism in the post-Christian culture of the West. For these, our two major evangelistic enterprises of to-day, the New Testament provides no *explicit* guidance" (p. 75). (But this chapter is justly entitled "New Testament Clues".)

It is not a criticism—since this book is just the right length for its purpose—but a further suggestion, to say that it would be interesting to match the chapter called "The Outsider" with another called "The Insider": considering the churchman's attitude towards evangelism, the reluctances and hindrances which he feels and their causes, contemporary developments, for better or worse, in his attitude towards missions at home or abroad, the training (or lack of it) which he receives in these matters, the factors which here and there in Britain to-day have produced a genuinely "missionary parish". It would be good if Mr Webster could pursue his analysis in this direction; and at least one reader would be very glad to know whether the Church really does well to co-operate with the "conservatizing evangelism" of a Billy Graham which in the light of this book cannot appear inadequate if not actually harmful—whether, in fact, we should be content to rejoice, with St Paul, that "every way . . . Christ is proclaimed". For this question is, after all, not a local one but one affecting the worldwide strategy of missions.

The Highway Press has continued its excellent standard of production and given us wonderful value for money.

P. C. Rodger.

Kilmacolm, Renfrewshire.

# SHORTER NOTICES

Psychical Phenomena. By Réginald-Omez, O.P. Burns and Oates. 1959. 7s. 6d.

This concise and informative little book takes its place as No. 36 in the series of "Faith and Fact Books", intended to supply Roman Catholic readers with authoritative statements which will "cover the whole area of modern knowledge in the light of Catholic teaching". It is a translation of *Supranormal ou surnaturel?*, a volume in the French "Je sais–Je crois" series, which is planned to serve the same purpose.

The book has something of the quality of an article in an encyclopedia, detailed and informative upon every aspect of parapsychology. Its author has had considerable first-hand knowledge of his subject. His general purpose is to cover the very wide range of investigation which comes within the field of psychical research, and at the same time to indicate the exact points at which psychical research and Catholic theology come into contact with one another. Difficulties at once arise as to the proper definition of parapsychology. So far as it makes good its claim to be an exact science there is no conflict at all with theology, and the writer is concerned to accept as demonstrated fact much of the field of mental phenomena, such as telepathy and clairvoyance, though he finds pre-cognition in its various forms to be in conflict with the theological doctrine that the future is known to God alone. In the same way mediumship comes under severe criticism, both on account of the unsavoury taint of fraud in which it has so often been involved, and because of its uncritical claim that the medium is under the influence of "controls" and "guides", and so is able to deliver communications with a high level of relevance and authenticity. The central theme of the book is the careful distinction between the supernatural, which is the direct action of God, and the paranormal which, though as yet not fully investigated or clearly understood, is clearly within the boundaries of scientific investigation and is well on the way to becoming a true science, in the full meaning of that term. The book ends on a positive note, with a plea for parapsychology as a science in its own right, and "a discipline necessary to many other studies".

L. W. Grensted.

Cirencester.

---

The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. By Francis Dvornik. Harvard University Press. $6.00.

The Apostolic Ministry. By Arnold Ehrhardt. Scottish Journal of Theology, Occasional Papers No. 7. Oliver and Boyd. 8s. 6d.

Both these books are by scholars of immense learning. Both are presented in a way which to a certain extent obscures their weight. Dr Ehrhardt's four lectures to a conference of clergy, somewhere, as internal evidence shows, in Manchester, were not originally in-

tended for publication. They have no footnotes, and no references in detail except to the Bible, and from time to time they are lightened with wit of a kind not commonly combined with such learning, e.g., "The position of the Holy Apostles has been intolerably lowered, admittedly with the confident expectation that they would regain their true position—with the bishops clinging to their coat-tails". "Eastward position and north end may never see eye to eye, unless their heads are made to turn 45° in the right direction." Dr Ehrhardt's conclusions, in twenty-two theses, are sufficiently startling, among them that "the Apostles themselves were not ministers of the Church", and that "The ordination of the Seven is meant by St Luke to establish a precedent for all ordinations in the Catholic Church". He holds that "to serve tables" refers to the eucharist, that "the Seven were ordained to administer not the blessed elements but the Holy Sacrament". He sets forth in five and a half packed pages a theory of the origin of the Apostolic Succession through the integration at Rome of two types of ordination, both based on Old Testament models which also influenced rabbinical ordinations, enthronement and the laying on of hands.

Here, as in his earlier and longer book on *The Apostolic Succession*,[1] Dr Ehrhardt seeks to establish the historical fact that the primary idea is one of succession to an office. He puts a question mark beside assistant bishops, and affirms that "the priest without parish duties is only a potential priest".

Dr Dvornik's book falls into two parts: a study of "the adaptation of the ecclesiastical organization to the administrative division" of the Roman empire before and after the peace of the Church, and of resistance to changes in this in Rome and Alexandria; and a much longer detailed account of the slow development of a legend whereby the apostolic function and office of the see of Constantinople might be confirmed through a theory of its apostolic origin. Like Dr Ehrhardt, he insists that the Apostles were not originally regarded as the first bishops of the sees founded by them. To this conception "which regarded the Apostles as teachers of the whole world and was reluctant to call them bishops of particular cities", the Byzantines returned in the twelfth and subsequent centuries, in the later stages of their controversy with Rome. The legend that St Andrew was the first bishop of Constantinople is here shown to be a development of the ninth century, when it had some importance as a means to defend the apostolic authority of all the five Patriarchal sees against imperial pretensions. But even then it was an alternative to another theory which made the imperial city the inheritor of the traditions of Ephesus and of St John. It was not in the first place a weapon against Rome, and never played any great part in anti-Roman polemic. Prof. Dvornik's book will interest Anglicans most through his treatment of situations which have long been subjects of controversy, such as the relationship between Rome and Alexandria at the first Council of Ephesus. But it seems to me that he makes

[1] Lutterworth Press, 1953.

too much in places of a contrast between "Roman apostolicity" and "Eastern adaptation to political organization". If St Peter was not originally regarded as the first bishop of either Rome or Antioch, it follows that the apostolic responsibilities of both these sees arose not from their special claims to apostolic foundation, but from their opportunities for making new foundations, which were intimately associated, especially in Rome, with their political position. No Roman Catholic writer has done so much as Prof. Dvornik to reveal the weak places in everyone's controversial armour.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

---

The Condition of Yorkshire Church Fabrics, 1300–1800. By J. S. Purvis. St Anthony's Hall Publications No. 14 (1958). 3s. 6d.

These Publications cover a range of historical topics, and are by no means confined to the North of England. The material treated by Dr Purvis is of wider interest than the title would suggest: although he quotes only from the records of the Northern Province, he draws attention to the general causes that have operated to dilapidate fabrics and fittings, at different times and in different ways; and he draws attention also to the various kinds of documentary evidence that students of parochial history have often ignored. The very modest price of this pamphlet—as of others in the series—should ensure the wide circulation that it deserves.

Kenneth Harrison.

King's College,
Cambridge.

---

Towards the Centre. By Charles Jeffries. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

One in Christ. By Dom Robert Petitpierre. Faith Press. 8s. 6d.

Both these books are concerned with the divisions of Christendom, and both start by acknowledging the unity which we already have in Christ. Both writers also show their thankfulness that they belong to the Church of England, which does not claim to be the only true Church or always to be right.

*Towards the Centre* is a careful and clear introduction to the theology of Christian unity, and a lucid exposition of the agreements and disagreements of Christians of different traditions. Although designed as a "follow-up" to the Lambeth Conference, it is by no means an ephemeral book, for it gathers together much material which is scattered in various reports. It does not attempt to say anything particularly new: its purpose is to present ordinary Christians with the scandal of disunion, and to encourage that dissatisfaction with the *status quo* which is one of the more hopeful symptoms of the majority of confessions to-day. With this purpose in mind, the author, a layman, addresses himself particularly to the conscience of the laity, and it is to be hoped that his book will achieve a wide circulation, and will stimulate thought, prayer, discussion and action.

Dom Robert Petitpierre's book is based on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and is naturally more deeply concerned with the underlying theology of unity than is *Towards the Centre*. There is a very healthy emphasis on the seriousness of moral heresy, and the author sees this to be as important as intellectual heresy: one example is heresy in marriage discipline, which he shows is a very serious barrier to Christian reunion. Therefore, sanctification rather than intellectual activity is the first step towards reunion. This is a salutary reminder that the real need is for Christians to subject their wills in obedience to God, and to learn to love him. Only with such dedication and obedience to the truth as we see it can we expect God to restore our broken unity.

Alan Rogers.

Madagascar.

---

The Destiny of Man. By Julian Huxley and others. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d.

Creation and Fall. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

*The Destiny of Man* is a series of articles previously published in *The Sunday Times*. In his initial essay, Sir Julian Huxley claims that biological evolution has ended in the decisive establishment of man as the dominant group, and that with man, a unique organism, a new phase in the evolutionary process has begun, the "psychosocial" stage which is concerned with the evolution of human cultures. In this phase man must actively co-operate, by discovering and realizing for himself a greater degree of fulfilment. The other contributors comment on this theme. Fr Corbishley and Dr Wand agree that theologians should collaborate with scientists in the task Huxley proposes, the former implying that Christianity is simply a useful auxiliary, the latter maintaining that a consideration of human destiny should start with Christ. But should the Christian accept so readily the suggestion that man's chief end is his own fulfilment? And would not such collaboration between theologians and scientists prove extremely difficult if the scientists were to adopt Huxley's own view of religion, Christianity included, as an entirely human construction?

Bonhoeffer's book provides a salutary antithesis. While he regards biological evolution as a witness to the biblical truth that man's corporeal existence belongs to his essential being, he confronts the exponent of evolutionary humanism with the assertion that man is created for the glory of God, that his uniqueness is not some inherent quality but a relationship with his Creator, and that the situation in which man attempts to live out of his own resources is an evil condition resulting from his disobedience. The exposition also provides an interesting analysis of the real meaning of human freedom and of the significance for man of the other person. Bonhoeffer's method of exegesis occasionally seems to be lacking in clarity. While agreeing in principle that Genesis should be interpreted in terms of the revelation in Christ, one could have wished

for more specific reference to the New Testament passages which appear to have been in the author's mind, and sometimes the exegetical leaps required of the reader are rather too extensive, as when the sentence of death upon Adam is interpreted as a promise of the Resurrection—the biblical meaning of death is surely that of separation from God. These are minor criticisms, however. By comparison with the essays in *The Destiny of Man* Bonhoeffer gives us at once a more fundamental analysis of the human situation and a more certain hope for the future.

M. E. Thrall.

Girton College,
Cambridge.

---

Religion and the Scientific Outlook. By T. R. Miles. George Allen and Unwin. 21s.

Revelation through Reason. By Errol E. Harris. George Allen and Unwin. 15s.

The God of Reason. By Régis Jolivet. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.

The first two of these books both claim explicitly to have settled the conflict between religion and science once and for all. Unfortunately they do it in completely different ways. Mr Miles is a linguistic philosopher who is still prepared to give very considerable weight to a modified form of the verification principle. The heart of his thesis is the exposure of what he calls "the absolute existence mistake". Questions about "what really exists" are meaningless to him because there is no agreement about the way in which they might be answered; they are in fact questions about the way in which people talk, masquerading as if they were inquiries about the contents of the universe; hence there can be no factually significant answers to them. Nevertheless, this conclusion does not involve a complete rejection of all that traditional metaphysics was trying to do, because statements like "values have a real existence" can be translated to mean "judgments of value require to be taken seriously". This no longer has the form of an empirical statement, but it remains an important thing to say. From this position the absolutist assertions of Materialism, Behaviourism and Determinism are easily assaulted, and there are illuminating discussions on psychical research and psychoanalysis. Mr Miles then turns to theology. Naturally he disallows any talk about the absolute existence of God; the right approach is "silence qualified by parables", and since all theological statements are in the language of parable there can be no possible conflict with the statements of science; the two languages are serving quite different functions. There remains, however, a small area of interaction, since the appropriateness of certain parables is affected by scientific and historical discoveries; in general, though, the acceptance of a series of parables is a matter of conviction and is comparable to a moral choice. The claim is made that a theology can be worked out on these lines which involves no radical departure from Christian orthodoxy.

Be that as it may, I must confess to lingering reactionary doubts about the complete rejection of the notion of absolute existence. I suspect that even Mr Miles smuggles it back hidden inside the words "important" and "serious"; and I should like to know what he means by "really" in the sentence on p. 86, "human beings really do matter". Similarly, I should welcome some more light on his concept of "silence", which he sees as one of the main differences between himself and Prof. Braithwaite, a comment which seems to imply that he gives some sort of positive content to it; it would have been illuminating if he had discussed this in the course of his very inadequate chapter on prayer. But, despite these doubts, I believe this is an important and well-written book which should help to clear away many of the misunderstandings in this field.

While Mr Miles solves the problem of the relation between religion and science by separating them so that they never meet, Prof. Harris solves it by asserting their identity. Religion for him is the crown and climax of science, and God is the culmination of the scale of forms which science has shown to be the basic structure of nature. It is towards the perfection of God that the whole evolutionary process points, and this receives concrete expression in terms of human personality in Christ. In all this there are strong echoes of Bishop Barnes and Dr Raven, but the argument is given a new slant by the way in which it is conducted as a sort of running debate with the linguistic philosophers. Parts of this are of considerable interest, especially the discussion of "necessary existence" which Prof. Harris is far from dismissing as a linguistic muddle. In fact, he even presents a rehabilitated form of the ontological argument in trying to frame "an idea of God that is implicit in all knowledge and immanent in all existence, so that it is the necessary presupposition of all discourse" (p. 56). Like Mr Miles he presents his conclusions as essentially compatible with Christian orthodoxy.

At first sight Mgr Jolivet seems to be trying to defend a conception of God which both the other authors would reject. His book is a straightforward presentation of the traditional Ways to God, moral and metaphysical, and he seems almost unaware of the linguistic difficulties of his task; his main opponents are pantheism and atheistic existentialism. Some parts of the discussion seem highly technical for so slight a work, but this may simply reflect the fact that the book was written for circumstances with which I am unfamiliar. For me it was redeemed by its last chapter where in a sympathetic discussion of atheism Mgr Jolivet makes a remark which could well serve as a text for all three books: "God is always 'at a crisis' in the sense that belief in God must always be won again, at every moment of our existence, and at every period of human history, in spite of the obstacles which it encounters, of the scandals which it raises, and, in general, in spite of all the negation which accompanies it in our finite state."

J. S. Habgood.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT: A CATHOLIC APPROACH. By Gustave Weigel, S.J. Geoffrey Chapman. 6s.

This essay bears all the marks of its origin, Roman and American. We can assure the writer that, as he hopes, "no one will see hostility in this sober and calm opinion". The first section is a concise account of the growth of the World Council of Churches. The extremely limited authority of the World Council is counter-balanced by its big hope; it is shown as what it is, a means to an end, not a Church in itself. The constitution's rules about membership have a too great latitude; it appears to the outsider that the enthusiastic "Union-now" pressure group have it over the more cautious "truth-first" wing.

The second section is an account of ecumenical activities within the Roman communion, and a justification of the Papal refusals to participate in a movement dubbed by the late Pope "panchristian".

In his third section, "Theological Reflections", Fr Weigel writes of the impossibility of the Romans changing their official attitude, but pleads for growing understanding, such as is being brought about by "the fruitful scriptural studies made to-day by Catholics and non-Catholics".

It is useful for us in the ecumenical movement to have this chance to see ourselves as others see us.

BIRMINGHAM. R. G. LUNT.

---

THE FACE OF LOVE. By Gilbert Shaw. Mowbray. 21s.

How refreshing it is to find a devotional book, by an experienced Anglican priest, who assumes that at least some of the laity are out of the spiritual kindergarten and that a good many others soon hope to be!

This is a full, deep, and elaborate scheme of prayer on the Stations of the Cross, designed to meet the needs of those capable of, and attracted to, affective spirituality. That it is not a book for everyone is its strong point, but for those who are seriously striving to make progress in the Affective way it is one to use quietly and systematically for a long time: it is essentially a book to *use* and to *own*. In his preface, the author states that it has taken many years to compile, and it will certainly take many years to pray. This use of the book, and the fruits which grow from it, form the only valid criteria by which it can honestly be judged.

Suffice it to say that I think Fr Shaw has succeeded in his attempt to stimulate personal prayer rather than to promote merely pious feelings. I am much more certain of his success in linking affective prayer with a deep intercession for the suffering world. This sense of vicarious suffering, this "outwardness", which is explained in the Introduction and sustained throughout, is the most important ascetical emphasis of all. But I cannot resist the suggestion that the devotions would be even better if they were presented in a more contemporary idiom: to some, a rather exaggerated "Bible" language can be helpful, to others it can be infuriating! But that is a criticism of neither group, still less of the book.

Instruction about how the system is to be used is woven into an important but rather disjointed Introduction (pp. 11, 12, 17, 18 f.). In a subsequent edition I wonder if the author would consider some revision here? Personally, I would like the Instruction expanded and printed separately, rather after the style of the Ignatian Directory. And, in spite of the healthy assumption of adult readers, I still wish the Introduction included the ever necessary warning that this type of devotion must never be allowed to detract from the more mundane duties of loyal churchmanship.

All that, however, is rather trivial. The book remains an important contribution to Anglican ascetical practice.

MARTIN THORNTON, O.G.S.

---

# BOOK NOTES

*We Have a Pope* by Albert Giovannetti (Geoffrey Chapman, 10s. 6d.) is a popular and pleasantly produced biography of John XXIII. *The Tablet* (11 April 1959) reports, by the way, on the authority of an Italian periodical that it is not unlikely the projected Roman General Council "will discuss the possibility of a diaconate independent of the priesthood, having special orders which could be conferred on married men". *The Baptist Union* by E. A. Payne (Carey Kingsgate Press, 21s.) is a well-documented and illustrated history of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland from its formation in 1812: it is likely to be a standard work for some time to come. The April number of *The Ecumenical Review* has an article by E. R. Wickham on "The Encounter of the Christian Faith and Modern Technological Society" in which he outlines incisively the wider implications of his book *Church and People in an Industrial Society*. *The Anglican Communion* by G. F. S. Gray (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) provides in small compass a useful catalogue of information about the development of Anglicanism outside these islands from 1814 to the present day, together with notes of its distinctive features. A handy book of reference, or for the instruction of interested inquirers.

---

# BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: W. Mays, *The Philosophy of Whitehead* (25s.); Bertrand Russell, *My Philosophical Development* (18s.); Pratima Bowes, *The Concept of Morality* (21s.).

BURNS OATES: Wladimir d'Ormesson, *The Papacy* (7s. 6d.); Albert Gélin, *The Religion of Israel* (7s. 6d.); George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church* (30s.); Bernard Piault, *What is the Trinity?* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker* (35s.); D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle* (22s. 6d.); C. K. Barrett, *Westcott as Commentator* (3s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: John L. McKenzie, S.J., *The Two-Edged Sword* (24s.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (U.S.A.): George E. DeMille, *Saint Thomas Church, New York, 1823–1954* ($3.00).

COLLINS: William Barclay, *The Plain Man's Book of Prayers* (2s. 6d.).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): E. L. Mascall, *The Importance of Being Human* (10s. 6d.).

DELACHAUX ET NIESTLÉ (NEUCHÂTEL): Max Thurian, *L'Eucharistie* (Swiss francs, 8.50).

DENT: H. Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the Dark Ages* (42s.).

FABER: Walter Kaufmann, *Critique of Religion and Philosophy* (25s.).

FAITH PRESS: Antony Snell, S.S.M., *New and Living Way* (18s.); Augustine Hoey, C.R., *Go Quickly and Tell* (6s.); Raymond Raynes, C.R., *Thoughts of a Religious* (10s. 6d.).

HAMISH HAMILTON: H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Kingdom of God in America* (10s. 6d.); Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity* (Vol. 1, 15s.; Vol. 2, 16s.); Charles Coulston Gillispie, *Genesis and Geology* (12s. 6d.); Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (10s. 6d.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): F. Edward Granz, *An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society* ($2.50).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Elisabeth Elliot, *Shadow of the Almighty* (16s.).

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF MENTAL IMAGES: C. C. L. Gregory and Anita Kohsen, *The O-Structure: An Introduction to Psychophysical Cosmology* (21s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Alan M. Stibbs, *God's Church* (4s.); D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Studies in the Sermon on the Mount* (15s.).

LINDEN PRESS: Hugh A. L. Rice, *Prayer Book Heritage* (12s. 6d.).

LONDON BIBLE COLLEGE: J. C. Connell, *Propitiation* (n.p.).

LONGMANS: Bernard Blackstone, *The Consecrated Urn* (45s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. B. Dehqani-Tafti, *Design of My World* (2s. 6d.); Emil Brunner, *The Letter to the Romans* (21s.); A. S. Herbert, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (7s. 6d.); Sister Gertrude, O.M.S.E., *Christian Prayer* (2s. 6d.).

METHUEN: P. E. Strawson, *Individuals* (25s.).

MITCHELL PRESS (VANCOUVER): Frank A. Peake, *The Anglican Church in British Columbia* (n.p.).

J. C. B. MOHR (TÜBINGEN): H. F. v. Campenhausen and H. Bornkamm, *Bindung und Freiheit in der Ordnung der Kirche* (DM. 3.80).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: Raymond F. Cyster, *Scripture and the Word of God* (10s. 6d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: Jean Bosc, *The Kingly Office of the Lord Jesus Christ* (16s.); Hermann Diem, *Kierkegaard's Dialectic of Existence* (21s.).

PATERNOSTER PRESS: D. Vaughan Rees, *The "Jesus Family" in Communist China* (6s.).

PRESSES DE TAIZÉ: Roger Schutz, *Vivre l'aujourd'hui de Dieu* (Frs 540).

ST ANDREW PRESS: James Reid, *Living in Depth* (21s.).

ST MARY'S, SWANSEA: David Walker, *St Mary's Church, Swansea* [a short history of the parish] (2s. 6d.).

ST MARY-OF-THE-ANGELS SONG SCHOOL: Desmond Morse-Boycott (Ed.), *The Angel* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: John Wolfenden, *The Educated Man Today and Tomorrow* (2s. 6d.); D. G. Christopherson, *On Being a Technologist* (2s. 6d.); St Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Loving God* (9s. 6d.); Margaret Cropper, *Prayers on the Sermon on the Mount* (1s.); Herbert Kelly, *The Gospel of God* (10s. 6d.); Max Thurian, *Marriage and Celibacy* (8s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: F. J. Sheed, *Reading for Catholic Parents* (2s.).

SOVEREIGN GRACE ADVENT TESTIMONY: George H. Fromow (Ed.), *B. W. Newton and S. P. Tregelles: Teachers of the Faith and the Future* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: R. H. Ward, *The Builders* (5s. 6d.); C. M. Chavasse, *This is Our Faith* (5s.); Joy Burden, *What About Nursing?* (2s. 6d.); Denis Baly, *Besieged City: The Church in the World* (4s. 6d.); Michael Hennell and Arthur Pollard (Eds), *Charles Simeon (1759–1836)* (21s.).

S.P.C.K. (FOR THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA SOCIETY): P. W. Turner, *Cry Dawn in Dark Babylon* (5s.); P. J. Lamb, *Sons of Adam* (5s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: E. M. Blaiklock, *The Acts of the Apostles* (9s. 6d.).

UNITED CHURCH PUBLISHING HOUSE (TORONTO): H. R. Alley, *Thinking of Rome? Think Twice!* (50 cents).

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Charles C. Torrey, *The Apocalypse of John* (40s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

## BEAUFOYS

# SANCTUARY

# COMMUNION WINE

Beaufoys *Sanctuary* Wine is of the highest standard, produced and bottled in Great Britain with the fermented juice of the finest quality grapes. As sole suppliers to the S.P.C.K. Beaufoys are proud to offer you this wine which has been prepared especially for Church purposes.

**7/6d Per Bottle**

(*Postage 2/- on 1 Bottle, 2/3d on 2 Bottles, 2/6d on 3 Bottles*)

**Packing and Carriage Free on all orders exceeding three bottles**

Quantities of one dozen or over may be obtained through the S.P.C.K. delivered free and subject to special quantity reductions of 1/- per dozen; 1/6 per dozen on 2 dozen; and 2/- per dozen on 3 dozen or more.

## A COMMENTARY ON
## THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

F. W BEARE, PH.D.

*Professor of New Testament, Trinity College, Toronto*

A study of St Paul's most moving Epistle as a prime source at once of devotional and doctrinal inspiration. A new enlivening translation of the text is preceded by an introduction which examines the authenticity and integrity of the Epistle, contemporary Philippi and its church, the character and construction of the letter, and its theology and spirituality. 16*s. net*

Already published in *Black's New Testament Commentaries:* edited by Professor H. Chadwick, D.D.: ROMANS by C. K. Barrett; ACTS by C. S. C. Williams; ST LUKE by A. R. C. Leaney. *Each* 25*s. net*

## THE DEAD SEA COMMUNITY
### ITS ORIGIN AND TEACHINGS

KURT SCHUBERT

The first practical guide of unimpeachable quality to the characteristics and history of the Qumran sect with whom the Dead Sea Scrolls originated. Professor Schubert of Vienna is a leader of the few European scholars who have specialized in the religion and thought of the sect. *July* 12*s.* 6*d. net*

RECENT SUCCESSES

## EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

J. N. D. KELLY, D.D.

"My guess is that this book will quickly become the student's indispensable guide in the study of early Christian doctrine." THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. 30*s. net*

## THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL

AUSTIN FARRER, D.D.

"No reader will be able to withold his admiration for the sustained brilliance and for the thoroughness with which Dr Farrer maintains his defence of human freedom." PROFESSOR D. M. MACKINNON. 28*s. net*

## JESUS IN HIS OWN TIMES

SHERMAN JOHNSON

"A valuable work . . . written by a good scholar who is well acquainted with recent studies, and in particular with studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls. . . . It is good to have such a work as this which integrates the new knowledge with what was already known." TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT. 12*s.* 6*d. net*

## THEY MET AT PHILIPPI

CARROLL E. SIMCOX

"A model of the kind of exegesis which every parish priest should be doing year in and year out for his own benefit and for the benefit of those in his charge. By such books as this the Church is edified. There ought to be many more of them." CHURCH TIMES. 9*s.* 6*d. net*

---

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK